

**From:** <e\_lehman@mit.edu>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:33 PM  
**Subject:** Opposed to HDTV copy protection

FROM:

NAME: Eric Lehman  
ADDRESS: 15 Pearl Street, Apt #16  
Cambridge, MA 02139

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I am writing in regard to the pending FCC decision on copy-protection for digital television broadcasts.

I am adamantly opposed to requiring copy-protection hardware in receiving and recording devices.

Such a requirement would amount to a tax on the public, serving only to jack up MPAA profits. This is tantamount to requiring every American to mail a twenty-dollar bill to Hollywood fat-cats.

The FCC's duty is clear: serve the public, not film studios.

Sincerely,

Eric Lehman

**From:** <mgifford@teentoday.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 5:34 PM  
**Subject:** Recording from TV

FROM:

NAME: Michael Gifford  
ADDRESS: 415 Willowridge Rd.  
Ardmore, OK 73401

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I am very disturbed of hearing that the FCC may rule that certain types of media, specifically TV, would be illegal to record for later viewing by consumers. I urge you to please consider the long-term impact of such a ruling from the consumers' point of view, and how our rights are being affected.

Thank you,

-Michael Gifford

**From:** <YJJM@aol.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(Info),DC.GWIA("Gtristani@fcc.gov","Mpowell...  
**Date:** Thu, Aug 31, 2000 7:41 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

I strongly believe that the FCC should enforce its regulations to protect consumers rights to record and review DTV signals for personal use. Since I work full-time, I rely on the ability to record certain programs in order to watch them in the evening or on weekends. I am sure that the majority of people recording programs are doing so for much the same reason, and not for any type of financial gain. Just as there are computer hackers who manage to break into systems and spread viruses despite protective measures taken by business and industry, there will always be those individuals who will be able to bypass this type of block despite preventative measures. In the end, blocking the ability to record programs will ultimately punish only those people who are not making or using tapes illegally.

Kathy K

**From:** "RapidPC Solutions" <rapidpc@execpc.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(info),DC.GWIA("Gtristani@FCC.gov","Mpowell...  
**Date:** Fri, Sep 1, 2000 1:46 PM  
**Subject:** Regarding PP Docket No. 00-67 (Summary: It's a bad idea)

Hello,

If I could have a moment of your time, I would like to voice my opinion on PP Docket No. 00-67. I do not believe that noncommercial home recording or use should be restricted or regulated in any way. I am becoming very concerned with the current trend in media legislation. The larger media companies seem to be rallying together to limit consumer usage rights through new laws. I am not surprised that they are launching another attack against VCR usage. While I understand their concerns about piracy; These are the same companies that think fast-forwarding through commercials is theft.

This bill could hurt me (I am a DTV subscriber) and other consumers in several ways. If copy scrambling or VCR blocking technologies are used for DTV or HDTV, it would harm consumers while providing them with no direct benefit. It would keep me from recording a program or movie that is broadcast at a time I am unable to watch it (i.e. working, sleeping, on vacation).

Furthermore, DTV is a subscription service with additional charges for premium movie channels. I am already paying to watch the programming, why do they want to keep me from taping it. I am not distributing bootleg recordings of the History channel; I just want to watch it at my leisure.

And there is the main difference between me and media companies. Television is recreation to me. To them, it is a business. My opinions are based on the desire to be entertained or informed. Their opinions are based on raising profit margins. They had to push for this sort of legislation because this restriction could only exist as a law. It's not the sort of limitation they could sell as a "feature" of their service. "You can watch it, but you can't tape it." Who would buy into that unless they were legally forced to?

Respectfully

James E. Kavanagh  
Owner, RapidPC Solutions  
Milwaukee, WI

**From:** <timebot@hotmail.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Wed, Aug 23, 2000 11:18 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Julie Zerbe  
ADDRESS: PO Box 10421  
Colorado Springs, CO 80932

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

I pay for satellite tv and still have to put up with commercials on many channels. We've paid for the signal, we've paid for the equipment and yet still they want to keep people from recording shows for private use. I'm getting tired of Hollywood's concern about what goes on in private homes, and yet they have the money to lobby for what they want while private citizens do not.

Thank you for reading my views.  
Sincerely,

Julie K. Zerbe

**From:** <jzulauf@gte.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Fri, Aug 25, 2000 4:39 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: John Zulauf  
ADDRESS: 645 Nelson Park Drive  
Longmont, CO 80503

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

Please prevent the CPSA or other 5C type "copy protection" schemes from becoming required or even allowed on US HDTV or other digital broadcasts. Home recording (Betamax) and other fair use rights depend on it being prevented.

The content access and copy management schemes proposed before the FCC are draconian in the extreme. All content would be watermarked and/or encrypted, all freedom for traditional fair use (archival, excerpt, parody, critique, et. al.) could and would be prevented unilaterally by the content providers. This is an unacceptable change from the last 50 years of broadcast media.

The case made before the FCC for these measures is based on a lie -- that digital content is more at risk from piracy than is analog. Inexpensive (\$25) silicon chips are now available (and in the heart of the TiVO and ReplayTV device) to convert from analog to digital content in real-time. Thus current broadcast and pay-per-view analog content is equal subject to the "infinite reproducibility" and "internet transmission" risks the media companies decry regarding digital content. Since the risk of piracy is no higher for digital content, there can be no need to more greatly restrict home recording, fair use, and the rights stemming from the Betamax decision of a generation ago.

The media content companies wish to impose the CPSA/5C measures based on the lie of greater risk which I address above. The real risk is in fact that of losing the "limited times" and "fair use" constitutional rights to an unflinching, restrictive set of access and copy controls on digital content.

Please see my comments to the Librarian of Congress on this matter.

<http://www.loc.gov/copyright/reports/studies/dmca/comments/lnit011.pdf>

Finally, when listening to the media companies, one cannot but think "the lady doth protest too much." With each new media technology (from Gutenberg to HDTV) the creators of content have cried "the sky is falling." Consider the uproar over VCR leading to the Betamax decision. In each case the profits of these companies have not been eroded, but instead greatly increase with the

adoption of each new technology. Even the "nightmare scenario" of Napster has seen CD sales rise in an unbroken stream.

Never before has the government bowed before the pressure of these fearful media Chicken Little luddites at the cost of individual freedom. Please ignore their pleas -- in they end they will profit from it without an undue burden being place upon the citizens or consumers.

Thank you for protecting the rights of the citizens of the United States in this matter.

Sincerely,

John M. Zulauf  
Longmont, CO

**From:** <chd@mcsi.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Fri, Aug 25, 2000 10:24 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Harvey DeGering  
ADDRESS: 1200 E. Central #82  
Sutherlin, OR 97479

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I have personal need due to age requiring the convenient time playing of programs. This form later says my opinions well :.....

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Harvey DeGering



**From:** <akrinst@aol.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Fri, Aug 25, 2000 11:20 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Simon Glickman  
ADDRESS: 5020 Klump Ave. #4  
No. Hollywood, CA 91601

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

New technology that provides greater convenience and satisfaction for consumers--without whom there would be no entertainment industry--should not be blocked simply because that industry fears its existing business model is threatened.

Thank you for reading my views.

Yours truly,  
Simon Glickman

**From:** <reinhold@world.std.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Sun, Aug 27, 2000 8:01 AM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Arnold Reinhold  
ADDRESS: 14 Fresh Pond Place  
Cambridge, MA 02138

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I would like to register my strong opposition to any restriction on home recording of digital television signals. Ever since home video recording technology first became available, the motion picture industry has been predicting that the sky would fall. It hasn't and home recording has freed the public from being chained to its television sets. We will not sit still while a new set of chains are fitted.

Sincerely,

Arnold G. Reinhold

**From:** <hd52colorado@usa.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Mon, Aug 28, 2000 4:27 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Alberto Squassabia  
ADDRESS: 3643 Arctic Fox Drive  
Fort Collins, CO 80525

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*  
Copy of message text follows:  
\*\*\*\*\*

In my family we use two VCR: one is connected to a signal source like antenna, cable, etc.; the second is connected to a viewing apparatus like a television. The viewing apparatus is not connected directly to the signal source; therefore, viewing is fully buffered and decoupled from broadcasting. This encourages deliberate planning on viewing content and viewing schedule.

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Broadcast interests claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies prohibiting home taping. As far as I'm concerned, if this partial opinion prevails, I will be cast out from the pool of citizens that may take advantage of the quality of public digital cable. With me, all those intent on maintaining the right of choosing when to watch a particular show will be similarly outcast. This defines an entire class of citizens subject to arbitrary and driven discrimination, causative of denial of their privilege to use their own time according to their own judgment, with forcible imposition, on grounds already defeated in a legal precedent. This ugly discrimination applies to the fruition of a paid public service!

I'm sure your agency is fully aware of the potential consequences of favoring

partial opinions with no legal standing.  
In short, huge legal expenses and  
eventual defeat. Please show some  
regulatory common sense.

In faith,

Alberto Squassabia  
Candidate, Colorado House District 52

**From:** <tjolley@swbell.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Mon, Aug 28, 2000 9:06 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Thomas Jolley  
ADDRESS: 12481 Betsy Ross Lane  
St. Louis, MO 63146

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

It seems that Hollywood studios are engaging in war against their customers (they think of us as pirates.) I have already bought a DVD drive for my computer only to find that I can't use it because my computer's OS is Linux. I think this smells of bait and switch.

So that this doesn't happen again to me or anyone else, I would like to make some comments. I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. I hope that you will take the appropriate action to ensure that we maintain the same rights we have now with analog technology; that we can record and view DTV signals.

Private, noncommercial home recording is NOT theft of service. Protect the consumer's best interests in your decisions and remember that digital doesn't make it easier for pirates.

Sincerely,  
Tom Jolley  
St. Louis, MO

**From:** <erical@webzone.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Thu, Aug 31, 2000 6:56 AM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Johnny Hutchinson  
ADDRESS: 8303 N 138 E Ave #201  
Owasso, OK 74055

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Keep the goddamned government bastards out of our business.

Johnny Hutchinson

**From:** <roadmastr@home.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Thu, Aug 31, 2000 11:44 AM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Ronald Ostberg  
ADDRESS: 1218 Apollo Avenue  
Aberdeen, SD 57401

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

Please keep the needs of the many viewers who cannot make the scheduled air times. You should know as well as any that we have to manage time, & not let time manage us.

Thank you for reading my views.

Ron Ostberg

**From:** <sparkledmd@aol.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Thu, Aug 31, 2000 9:38 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: terry dalsey  
ADDRESS: 945 lenmar drive  
blue bell, PA 19422

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

I know that this is a form letter which I am supposed to simply add my name to, but I feel that I need to add a point of discussion which is not mentioned in the letter. Maybe this point was part of the Betamax case. I'm not a lawyer, so I don't know. However, as a consumer, I PAY FOR THE ABILITY TO HAVE CABLE PROVIDED TO MY HOME. I do not have HDTV as of this time, but even if I did, THEFT DOES NOT HAPPEN WHEN YOU PAY FOR A SERVICE. CABLE IS A SERVICE. PAID FOR.

I work evenings and am not able to watch shows I enjoy. Even the reruns--unless I record them on my VCR. This right should not be taken from me. If I cannot record these shows which I enjoy, then I may as well cancel my cable. Then it will be THEIR loss of income THEY will need to worry about. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Terry Ann Dalsey



**From:** <Hermnels@Hotmail.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Sat, Sep 2, 2000 7:13 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Herman Borstelmann  
ADDRESS: 4756 Lakeside Drive  
Blairsville, GA 30512

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

PS-I think,until our Govt charges TV stations,and Hollywood Film Companies for the use of our airspace to broadcast their programs,that they should not be able to charge USC !!!

H.BORSTELMANN

SINCERELY,

HERMAN

**From:** <kennedy@fiber.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 2:32 AM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Phillip Kennedy  
ADDRESS: 3592 South 2175 East  
Salt Lake City, UT 84109

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

It has come to my attention that the MPAA and other content providers want to restrict my ability to record digital signals broadcast to my home via cable and other means. I find this to be a blatant attempt to remove my rights under copyright law for "fair use". I only plan to use such recordings personal non-commercial use, and within the strict confine of the law. I humbly ask that you do not let them encumber recording equipment I may use in my own home. Such devices are only meant to hurt the consumer, as people who traffic in illegal recordings (even though it is not really economical to do so) will always find a way around it. I also ask that your decisions be consistent with the Supreme court ruling in the Betamax case.

Sincerely,

Phillip Kennedy  
Salt Lake City, Utah

**From:** <iamcaptna@hotmail.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 12:24 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Howard King  
ADDRESS: 1520 Turner Rd.  
Cumming, GA 30041

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

PS-We should not be considered criminals when we record things on TV or Satellite or other sources for private viewing at later times

**From:** <jhitch@gte.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 12:25 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: John Emerson  
ADDRESS: 31 North St  
Lexington, MA 02420

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Personally I see no point to digital television if all we can watch in delayed form is low def analog tape! Why spend the money and hassle with the antenna problems to watch junky vcr's?

And what gives Hollywood these special claims on copyright ownership? If we can't copy movies, you should close down all public libraries too, to be fair to authors.

And I am not satisfied with one copy either!!! I want to be able to organize my tapes by moving something in the middle of a tape to the start of a fresh one without losing quality! So as a minimum I need to be able to make 2 copies!

Only copying for resale should be protected rights for Hollywood.

Sincerely,

John Emerson

**From:** <iamcaptna@hotmail.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 12:25 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Howard King  
 ADDRESS: 1520 Turner Rd.  
 Cumming, GA 30041

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

PS-We should not be considered criminals when we record things on TV or Satellite or other sources for private viewing at later times. Sincerely, Howard King

**From:** <davoice@bigfoot.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 12:57 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67 - DTV Home Recording and Copyrights

FROM:

NAME: Daniel Pentecost  
ADDRESS: 110 Pine Lake Pl.  
Brandon, MS 39047

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs and other digital recording devices can be connected to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed.

Hollywood studios are apparently claiming that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. While I applaud them for trying to vigilantly protect their copyrights so as not to have them nullified, this idea is simply proposterous - and contrary to existing Supreme Court rulings.

The Motion Picture Association of America complained \*loudly\* when conventional VCRs first appeared. To them it seemed the world was about to end. In fact, the world did not come to an end and subsequently their members are now making a substantial profits from home video sales. Their "the sky is falling, the sky is falling" act is getting a little old and I hope that the FCC is able to see it for what it is - pure absurdity.

As such, I encourage you to protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals as well as other digital signals and respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service.

In short, I encourage the Commission to take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,  
Daniel Pentecost  
davoice@bigfoot.com

**From:** <congress.nw.dc.us@narcissus.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:21 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

**NAME:** Ben Rosengart  
**ADDRESS:** 229 Hudson St. #4  
New York City, NY 10013

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Hollywood studios apparently claim that home recording is the same as theft of service and that this justifies limiting home taping. Your agency should protect consumers' rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court's ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service! In short, the Commission should take action to protect the interests of consumers in this proceeding. Thank you for reading my views.

Yours in trepidation,  
Ben Rosengart

**From:** "Shayne Lennox" <slennox@primus.com.au>  
**To:** DC.GWIA("Bkennard@FCC.gov")  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 10:11 PM  
**Subject:** Digital TV copy protection

Dear Chairman Kennard,

I've recently been made aware that the FCC is soon to reach a decision on the issue of whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed. Although I live in Australia, the decision made by the FCC in the US will inevitably have a great impact on decisions made on the issue in this country, and I feel compelled to briefly express my opinion to you directly.

It has long been a fundamental right of consumers to make fair use of the television programmes they receive in their homes. These rights include the ability to time shift and/or archive programmes using video recorders. The proposals made by the MPAA to introduce new copy protection systems into digital video appliances threaten these rights.

The introduction of digital TV should not change the right of consumers to record programmes in their own homes. History has proven that the vast majority of consumers can be trusted to freely record television programmes for their own use without affecting the viability of the motion picture industry.

It has been suggested that, as a compromise, copy protection should apply to pay-per-view programmes only. I do not agree with this. Consumers have had the right to time shift pay-per-view programmes in their own homes for years, and this right should not be infringed upon. I do not believe any restrictions should be placed on the programmes consumers are allowed to record from their own TVs.

Yours Sincerely,

Shayne Lennox  
slennox@primus.com.au  
Sydney, Australia

Cc: info@HRRRC.org

**CC:** DC.CMGI(info)



**From:** "Dustin Goodwin" <dustin@clickthings.com>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(info),DC.GWIA("Gtristani@FCC.gov","Mpowell...  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:51 PM  
**Subject:** protect\_consumers'\_rights\_to\_record\_and\_view\_DTV\_signals

In PP Docket No. 00-67, the FCC should enforce its regulations to protect consumers\* rights to record and view DTV signals. The Commission should respect the Supreme Court\*s ruling in the Betamax case, and not equate private, noncommercial home recording with theft of service!

- Dustin -

**From:** "Karl Low" <kwil@myself.com>  
**To:** DC.GWIA("Bkennard@FCC.gov")  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 7:33 PM  
**Subject:** Regarding PP Docket No. 00-67

Dear Chairman Kennard,

Like many other letters you are no doubt receiving, I'm writing to you about the FCC's upcoming decision on requiring copy protection technology be placed in all VCRs and other recording devices. While I am not a citizen of the United States, being Canadian and receiving a large portion of our electronic consumer goods from America, I do believe I have valid concerns regarding this ruling.

While the MPAA has stated that they would only place the copy-protection codes on a small portion of the material, I would argue that as a consumer, when I have purchased the rights to view that material (be it through pay-per-view or by advertising), I have purchased access to the content, and not to the time that the material is chosen to be shown.

In other words, if I choose to pay for the latest and greatest in "WWF LIVE EXTRAVAGANZA" or whatever, and happen to be busy with work or other matters during the scheduled time for broadcast, I should not be penalized by not being able to record this show and playing it later when I have the opportunity to watch it. Similarly, should I like to watch 60 minutes, I should be able to shift the content of this show (complete with its advertising) to whatever time I like. This can easily be extrapolated to any show on the air.

Under this, it is difficult to see what difference there is between the MPAA merely blocking "some" shows or blocking all of them as any blocking of time shifting on any show is an abrogation of my rights to enjoy the public medium.

The other argument the MPAA provides is that without some form of copy protection then the risk of widespread copying of hot movies far outweigh the potential profit from broadcasting the material. Unfortunately, this argument has no evidence to back it up as there are numerous companies both in America and in Canada that provide pay-per-view material and currently no controls on copy protection. Since the number and variety of material these services provide is actually on the rise, it seems that the MPAA's assertion in this is simply unfounded.

Additionally, this argument is the same we heard with the advent of audio tapes. Home taping did not kill music, and if the state of music industry today is any indication, has not even put a dent in it.

To me it seems that the MPAA's request stems from a desire to increase their control over what is meant to be a public resource, and not from any desire to benefit the public as a whole. I hope you will agree with me in this and decide that requiring technological copy-protection measures not only is against the public interest, but actually would serve to create further hurdles to the public's usage of a broadcast medium.

Thank you very much for your attention through this (longwinded) letter.

Karl Low

4314 - 6th Avenue SE  
Calgary, AB CANADA  
T2A 3B2

**CC:** DC.CMGI(info),DC.GWIA("Gtristani@FCC.gov","Mpowell...

**From:** <jeff@binaryfeed.org>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:52 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Jeffrey Wescott  
ADDRESS: 1290 Grove Street; #605  
San Francisco, CA 94117

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I understand the Commission soon will be deciding whether VCRs can be hooked up to digital cable systems, and whether home recording from digital cable will be allowed.

Recent court rulings / government decisions on related topics have gone past irritating me and have actually begun to frighten me. I'm noticing a very strong trend of big business (MPAA, RIAA, etc.) gaining the ability to dictate to the consumer what s/he can / cannot do. What I'm asking is that you not only consider the implications of THIS case, but the larger implications as well. Power should be in the hands of consumers, not businesses. Please vote accordingly. The betamax decision can be used as a good example.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Wescott

**From:** <timur@tabi.org>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:53 PM  
**Subject:** Comment on Copy Protection Technology Dispute

FROM:

NAME: Timur Tabi  
ADDRESS: 1508 Southport Drive #119  
Austin, TX 78704

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

I have learned that the Motion Picture Association of America wants VCR and HDTV manufacturers to be required to include technology that will prevent me from recording certain digital TV broadcasts for the purpose of watching them later (a.k.a. time-shifting).

I am opposed to such legislation. The law already allows me to "time-shift" any TV program that is displayed on my television. It also lets me watch such recordings over and over again.

The MPAA would like nothing more than to strip me of all such rights. I feel that they are an unethical corporation that cares much more about their bottom line than consumers such as myself.

Therefore, I am writing you this letter to let you know that you should oppose any restrictions to my ability to watch and record TV programs, especially those that the MPAA wants.

I urge you to decide against the MPAA.

Sincerely,

Timur Tabi

**From:** <cpt.k@usa.net>  
**To:** DC.CMGI(AKitey)  
**Date:** Tue, Sep 5, 2000 4:55 PM  
**Subject:** PP Docket No. 00-67

FROM:

NAME: Joshua Stratton  
ADDRESS: 13716 NE 11th St  
Bellevue, WA 98005

This message was sent to:

Dear Chairman

\*\*\*\*\*

Copy of message text follows:

\*\*\*\*\*

It has come to my attention that the FCC will soon be deciding whether or not VCRs attached to digital cable systems will be legally able to record transmissions.

Frankly, it is appalling that this question should even have to be asked. Of course it is legal. If Sony v. Universal were not clear enough, I would like you, and the other members deciding this issue to ask yourself the following question: How does progressively restricting things from viewers; forcing people to pay for materials that are effectively copyrighted in perpetuity every single time they wish to view them; how does this serve the SINGLE purpose of copyrights in the US, as explicitly defined by the Constitution? The definition is that copyrights are only valid insofar as they promote the advancement of the arts. This has consistently been interpreted by the Supreme Court to mean that the interests of copyright holders are a distant, distant second to that of the public at large.

Does the inability to exercise constitutionally protected rights serve a public interest more than it serves that of copyright holders? I think not.

Your duty is clear. Recording must be protected.

Sincerely, Joshua Stratton